

3.	Consultation Process and Review of the Hudson Application	49
a.	Responses by Local Governments	50
b.	Responses by Local Residents and Activists	51
c.	Responses by Wisconsin and Minnesota Tribal Governments and Associations	54
1)	Tribal Opposition to the Hudson Application Was Led by the Minnesota Indian Gaming Association	54
2)	MIGA and Its Members Contact the BIA in Washington	55
3)	MIGA and Its Members Contact the Minneapolis Area Office of BIA	58
4.	The BIA Issues a Draft Finding of No Significant Impact	63
5.	Minneapolis Area Office Recommends Approval Under IGRA	66
C.	Coordinated Opposition Efforts By Minnesota and Wisconsin Tribes	71
1.	Opponents Mobilize Congressional Support	72
2.	MIGA Considers Political Contributions	75
3.	The Coordinated Opposition Lobbying Effort Focuses Its Political Arguments and Agenda	77
a.	The Tribal Opponents Identify Their Arguments, and Their Audience	77
b.	O'Connor & Hannan Joins the Opposition	82
c.	The Opponents Secure a Feb. 8 Meeting with Secretary Babbitt's Counselor, John Duffy	86
D.	Events Occurring During Early Analysis of the Hudson Application by DOI's Indian Gaming Management Staff (December 1994 - May 1, 1995)	89
1.	IGMS's Initial Analysis Identifies Concerns With the Best Interests Analysis, But Finds That The Casino Would Not Be Detrimental to The Surrounding Community	89
2.	The Feb. 8, 1995 Meeting of Opponent Tribal Representatives and DOI Officials at Congressman Oberstar's Office	93
a.	The "Strategy" Meeting	94
b.	The Meeting with John Duffy and George Skibine	95
3.	Opponent Representatives Meet with DOI Chief of Staff Thomas Collier on March 15, 1995	100
4.	DOI Sets April 30, 1995, Deadline For Additional Comments	103
5.	The Secretary and Senior DOI Officials Meet with Wisconsin Tribes on April 8, 1995	105